

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks Examiner for the detailed Office Action dated July 29, 2008. In response to the issues raised, the Applicant offers the following submissions and amendments. We also enclose a Terminal Disclaimer linking the term and ownership of any patent granted on the present application to that of co-pending application USSN 10/922,836.

Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to define that the printing and display device has a display data connection that can be selectively connected to an external computer for receiving the data used for the image displayed on screen. Claim 1 also defines the print data connection. This clarifies that the printing and display device is a stand alone device that is separate from the computer providing it with images for display.

Claims 12, 13 and 14 have been amended to address the antecedent issues identified by the Examiner.

Claims 31 has been amended to align with the amended claim 1.

Accordingly, the claims do not add any new matter.

Non-Statutory Double Patenting

We submit that the enclosed Terminal Disclaimer prevents any unjustified timewise extension of exclusive rights or harassment from multiple assignees.

Claims – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3, 6, 8 to 16, 18, 21 to 24, 27, 28, 32 and 33 stand rejected as obvious in light of US 6,120,127 to Inoue et al, in view of US 6,973,518 to Purpura.

Amended claim 1 is limited to a printing and display device that has a display data connection for selectively receiving the data used for the image shown on the screen. We

submit that this explicitly directs the claim to a stand alone computer monitor that has a flat panel display and a printer. In the cited references, the display screens are permanently connected to their respective computers. The screens attached to the cited laptops can not selectively disconnect from the microprocessor. Restricting claim 1 to a display that displays images from image data received via a connection from an external computer, excludes the laptop with inbuilt printer shown in Inoue. The display unit 3313 is clearly not detachable from the processor body 3301.

Purpura discusses a docking station for configuring airline passengers' laptops prior to boarding and using the onboard network and peripherals. There is no suggestion of a stand alone display with printer.

In light of the above, Inoue and Purpura do not teach all the elements of amended claim 1. Accordingly, claims 1, 3, 6, 8 to 16, 18, 21 to 24, 27, 28, 30, 32 and 33 are not obvious in light of the cited references.

Claims 2 and 19 stand rejected as obvious in light of Inoue and Purpura in further view of US 6,593,944 to Nicolas et al. As discussed above, Inoue and Purpura do not disclose a display device with a stand that supports a flat panel display and a printer for operation at a position remote from the computer providing it with images for display. Similarly, Nicolas is also silent as to a display device with this combination of features.

Claim 4 stands rejected as obvious in light of Inoue and Purpura in further view of US 6,086,185 to Inui et al. As discussed above, Inoue and Purpura do not disclose a display device with a stand that supports a flat panel display and a printer for operation at a position remote from the computer providing it with images for display. Similarly, Inui is also silent as to a display device with this combination of features.

Claims 5, 17, 20 and 34 stand rejected as obvious in light of Inoue and Purpura in further view of US 5,984,446 to Silverbrook. As discussed above, Inoue and Purpura do not disclose a display device with a stand that supports a flat panel display and a printer for operation at a position remote from the computer providing it with images for display. Similarly, Silverbrook is also silent as to a display device with this combination of features.

Claims 25 and 26 stand rejected as obvious in light of Inoue and Purpura in further view of US 6,771,388 to Morikawa et al. As discussed above, Inoue and Purpura do not disclose a display device with a stand that supports a flat panel display and a printer for operation at a position remote from the computer providing it with images for display. Similarly, Morikawa is also silent as to a display device with this combination of features.

Claim 31 stands rejected as obvious in light of Inoue and Purpura in further view of US 7,003,279 to Nickum. As discussed above, Inoue and Purpura do not disclose a display device with a stand that supports a flat panel display and a printer for operation at a position remote from the computer providing it with images for display. Similarly, Nickum is also silent as to a display device with this combination of features.

Claim 35 stands rejected as obvious in light of Inoue and Purpura in further view of US published application 2003/0197887 to Shenoy. As discussed above, Inoue and Purpura do not disclose a display device with a stand that supports a flat panel display and a printer for operation at a position remote from the computer providing it with images for display. Similarly, Shenoy is also silent as to a display device with this combination of features.

As amended claim 1 is the sole independent claim, it follows from the above that the dependent claims are non-obvious in light of the cited references.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed and the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



Kia Silverbrook

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street

Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762